

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the comments set forth fully below. Claims 1-52 were previously pending in this application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-52 have been rejected. By the above amendments, Claims 1, 4, 5, 16, 21, 22, 25, 28, 33, 35 and 39 have been amended. Claims 1-52 are now pending in this application.

Double Patenting

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-52 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-29 of Application No. 09/705,472. To the extent necessary, the applicants will address this provisional rejection, once all other grounds for rejection have been overcome and removed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent. No. 6,505,243 to Lortz (hereinafter "Lortz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,542,897 to Lee (hereinafter "Lee"). Lortz teaches providing help information to a network-attached device. Within Lortz, it is taught that a connection notification is received for the network attachable device over a first data path. Device specific help information is retrieved for the network attachable device over a second data path and provided to a configuration interface. Lortz does not teach or suggest downloading or executing an interactive support service application to provide a remote interactive support service process for a selected device. Further, Lortz does not teach or suggest downloading an interactive support service application that is a diagnostic application including instructions executable by the selected device to automatically determine a current functional state of the selected device.

Lee teaches a customer support system that provides support for a consumer product using the Internet. Lee teaches providing a service menu on a service page as a support page for providing a product model guidance, the usage of various resources related to the consumer product and technical information relating to the consumer product. (Lee, col. 2, lines 52-56) Lee further teaches that the service page may also have a download page for downloading software related to the consumer product to the user computer via the Internet. (Lee, col. 2, lines 56-58) Lee teaches that the download page 320 is a module for downloading PC-related software desired by the user to a user computer when the user experiences a particular program during use of a PC, when the version of software currently being used is to be upgraded, or when new application software is desired to be installed. (Lee, col. 5, lines 44-49) Lee does not teach downloading an interactive support service application associated with a selected device from a selected server computing system and executing the downloaded interactive support service application at a gateway device to provide a remote interactive support service process for the selected device. Accordingly, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest downloading an interactive support service application associated with a selected device from a selected server computing system and executing the downloaded interactive support service application at a gateway device to provide a remote interactive support service process for the selected device. Further, Lortz does not teach or suggest downloading an interactive support service application that is a diagnostic application including instructions executable by the selected device to automatically determine a current functional state of the selected device. Accordingly, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest downloading an interactive support service application that is a diagnostic application including instructions executable by the selected device to automatically determine a current functional state of the selected device.

In contrast to the teachings of Lortz, Lee and their combination, the remote manual, maintenance and diagnostic services for networked electronic devices provides a process of

identifying and managing interactive support service applications associated with consumer electronic devices in a home network system. A client side process, executed by a client computing system in the home network, operates in conjunction with a server side process executed by a server computing system that is communicatively coupled with the client computing system via the Internet. In one embodiment, the client computing system is implemented by a gateway device communicatively coupled with each of the electronic devices via the home network. The gateway device is operative to access the Internet and is communicatively coupled with a display unit. The interactive support service includes a remote interactive manual service providing educational instructions to a user of the home network system regarding operation of the selected device, a remote interactive maintenance/diagnostic service for instructing a home network system user in solving maintenance problems associated with the selected device, or a combination remote interactive manual/maintenance/diagnostic service. As described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach downloading an interactive support service application associated with a selected device from a selected server computing system and executing the downloaded interactive support service application at a gateway device to provide a remote interactive support service process for the selected device. Further, as described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest downloading an interactive support service application that is a diagnostic application including instructions executable by the selected device to automatically determine a current functional state of the selected device.

Within the specification of the present application, examples of interactive support service applications are provided. As described within the specification of the present application

FIG. 6 shows a block diagram generally illustrating an exemplary support service application GUI screen at 230 that is displayed by the service management system 92 (FIG. 1) on the display device 42 (FIG. 1) in response to activation by

the user of the service/help button 220 (FIG. 5). The GUI screen 230 includes: a button 232 for initiating a remote interactive manual process for instructing the user regarding operation of the camcorder; a button 234 for initiating a remote interactive maintenance process for instructing the user in solving maintenance problems associated with the device; a button 236 for initiating a remote interactive diagnostic process for automatically diagnosing problems with the associated device; and a button 238 for initiating an integrated application process that provides for controlling the associated device and another selected one of the devices (e.g., a video editing process that utilizes and combines the functions of the camcorder 64 and digital video recorder 62 of FIG. 1). [Present Specification, page 14, lines 10-21, Figure 6]

Another example of an interactive support application is also described

FIG. 7 shows a block diagram generally illustrating a first exemplary support GUI screen at 240 provided by an interactive support service application 170 (FIG. 3) loaded by the service management system 92 in order to provide interactive remote supports for the camcorder 64 (FIG. 1). As further explained below, a support service process provided by the loaded application may include the steps of: communicating with the particular device via the home network in order to determine a current functional state of the particular device; determining diagnostic information based on the current functional state of the device, the diagnostic information indicating a problem or other information associated with operating of the device; and determining user instructional information based on the current functional state of the device and/or the diagnostic information. [Present Specification, page 14, lines 22-31, Figure 7]

It is further taught within the specification of the present application that “each of the support service applications 170 (FIG. 3) may include instructions and data (e.g., text, and graphical images) for providing any type of interactive support for any type of consumer electronics device.” [Present Specification, page 15, lines 20-26] Neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach downloading and executing such interactive support service applications.

Within the Office Action it is stated that downloading and executing web pages by a browser is equivalent to executing the downloaded interactive support service application, as

claimed within the present application. The applicants respectfully disagree. By the above amendments, the claims of the present application have been amended to specify that the interactive support service application is a diagnostic application including instructions executable by said selected device to automatically determine a current functional state of said selected device. This is not taught or suggested by Lortz or Lee, either individually or in combination.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a process of identifying and managing interactive support service applications associated with consumer electronic devices, the process for execution by a gateway device communicatively coupled with each of the electronic devices via a home network, the gateway device being operative to access the Internet and being communicatively coupled with a display unit. The process of Claim 1 comprises determining device identification information associated with a selected one of the electronic devices for which a support service application is required, providing said device identification information to a selected server computing system via the Internet, downloading an interactive support service application associated with said selected device from the selected server computing system and executing said downloaded interactive support service application at the gateway device to provide a remote interactive support service process for said selected device. It is further specified in Claim 1 that said interactive support service application comprises a diagnostic application including instructions executable by said selected device to automatically determine a current functional state of said selected device and determine diagnostic information based on said current functional state of said selected device, said diagnostic information indicating a problem associated with said selected device. As described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest downloading an interactive support service application associated with a selected device from a selected server computing system and executing the downloaded interactive support service application at a gateway device to provide a remote interactive support service process for the selected device. As further described above,

neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach that said interactive support service application is a diagnostic application including instructions executable by said selected device to automatically determine a current functional state of said selected device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination.

Claims 2-4, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 14 are all dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 2-4, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 14 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 5, 8, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,788 to Kim et al. (hereinafter “Kim”). Claims 5, 8, and 15 are all dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 5, 8, and 15 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee and Kim and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,507 to Wookey (hereinafter “Wookey”). Claim 6 is dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 6 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,448 to Hemphill et al. (hereinafter “Hemphill”). Claims 11 and 12 are both dependent on the independent Claim 1. As described above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the

teachings of Lortz, Lee and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 11 and 12 are both also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 16, 17, 19-21 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee.

As discussed above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach downloading an interactive support service application associated with a selected device. Further, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest a service manager supported by the platform and being operative to form a uniform resource locator based on the device identification. As also discussed above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest that the interactive support application is a diagnostic application including instructions executable by said selected device to automatically determine a current functional state of said selected device.

The independent Claim 16 is directed to a service management software system for execution by a gateway device communicatively coupled with at least one electronic device via a home network, the software system for identifying and managing interactive support service applications associated with each of the electronic devices. The service management software system of Claim 16 comprises a home network bridge supported by a platform for receiving device identification information associated with a selected one of the electronic devices for which a service application is required, a service manager supported by the platform and being operative to form a uniform resource locator based at least in part on said device identification information and an internet bridge supported by the platform and being responsive to receive said uniform resource locator from said service manager via the platform, and being operative to access a selected server computing system via the Internet using said uniform resource locator, and to download an interactive support service application associated with said selected device, wherein the platform is operative to dynamically load and unload support service applications. It is further specified in Claim 16 that said interactive support application comprises a diagnostic application including instructions executable by said selected device to automatically determine a

current functional state of said selected device and determine diagnostic information based on said current functional state of said selected device, said diagnostic information indicating a problem associated with said selected device. As described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest downloading an interactive support service application associated with a selected device. Further, as described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest a service manager supported by the platform and being operative to form a uniform resource locator based on the device identification. As also discussed above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest that the interactive support application is a diagnostic application including instructions executable by said selected device to automatically determine a current functional sate of said selected device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 16 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination.

Claims 17, 19-21 and 24 are all dependent on the independent Claim 16. As described above, the independent claim 16 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 17, 19-21 and 24 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Lortz in view of Lee and further in view Hemphill. Claim 18 is dependent on the independent Claim 16. As described above, the independent claim 16 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 18 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee and further in view of Kim. Claim 22 is dependent on the independent Claim 16. As described above, the independent claim 16 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 22 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee and Kim and further in view of Wookey. Claim 23 is dependent on the independent Claim 16. As described above, the independent claim 16 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claim 23 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 25-27 and 29-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. As described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest providing the selected interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system which includes instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process associated with the particular device. As also discussed above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest that the selected interactive support application is a diagnostic application including instructions executable by said particular device to automatically determine a current functional state of said selected device.

The independent Claim 25 is directed to a process of identifying and providing interactive support service applications associated with consumer electronic devices, the process for execution by a server computing system that is communicatively coupled with at least one client computing system via the Internet. The process of Claim 25 comprises receiving device identification information from a client computing system, the device identification information indicating a particular consumer electronic device, accessing a selected interactive support service application associated with the particular device based on said device identification information and providing said selected interactive support service application associated with the particular device to the client computing system, said selected interactive support application including instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process associated with the particular device. It is further specified in Claim 25

that said selected interactive support application comprises a diagnostic application including instructions executable by said particular device to automatically determine a current functional state of said particular device and determine diagnostic information based on said current functional state of said particular device, said diagnostic information indicating a problem associated with said selected device. As described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest providing the selected interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system which includes instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process associated with the particular device. As also discussed above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach or suggest that the selected interactive support application is a diagnostic application including instructions executable by said particular device to automatically determine a current functional state of said selected device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 25 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination.

Claims 26, 27 and 29-32 are all dependent on the independent Claim 25. As described above, the independent claim 25 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 26, 27 and 29-32 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 28 and 33-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee and Wookey and further in view of Kim. Claims 28 and 33-38 are all dependent on the independent Claim 25. As described above, the independent claim 25 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 28 and 33-38 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 39-52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lortz in view of Lee, Kim and Wookey. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. As described above, neither Lortz, Lee nor their combination teach

providing an interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system via the Internet, the application including instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process including automatically determining a problem associated with the particular device. Further, neither Kim or Wookey teach or suggest providing an interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system via the Internet, the interactive application including instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service application including automatically determining a problem associated with the particular device. Accordingly, neither Lortz, Lee, Kim, Wookey nor their combination teach providing an interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system via the Internet, the interactive application including instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process including automatically determining a current functional state of said selected device and a problem associated with the particular device.

The independent Claim 39 is directed to a process of identifying and providing interactive support service applications associated with consumer electronic devices, the process for execution by a server computing system that is communicatively coupled with at least one client computing system via the Internet, the client computing system being communicatively coupled with at least one electronic device. The process of Claim 39 comprises receiving device identification information from the client computing system, the device identification information indicating a particular consumer electronic device that is communicatively coupled with the client computing system, providing an interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system via the Internet, the application including instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process including automatically determining a current functional state of said selected device and a problem associated with the particular device, receiving diagnosis information from

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: SONY-22100

the client computing system, said diagnosis information indicating a diagnosed problem associated with the particular device that is determined as a result of execution of said instructions by the client computing system and creating a database record based on said diagnosis information and said device identification information, said record indicating said diagnosed problem associated with the particular device. As discussed above, neither Lortz, Lee, Kim, Wookey nor their combination teach providing an interactive support service application associated with a particular device to a client computing system via the Internet, the interactive application including instructions executable by the client computing system for providing an interactive support service process including automatically determining a current functional state of said selected device and a problem associated with the particular device. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 39 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, Kim, Wookey and their combination.

Claims 40-52 are all dependent on the independent Claim 39. As described above, the independent claim 39 is allowable over the teachings of Lortz, Lee, Kim, Wookey and their combination. Accordingly, Claims 40-52 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

For the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, he is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: May 10, 2005

By: Jonathan O. Owens

Jonathan O. Owens
Reg. No. 37,902
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))
I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

- 30 -

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Date: 5/10/05 By: 